

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Thu Nov 10 07:58:53 1994  
From: JosephWP@aol.com  
Date: Thu, 10 Nov 1994 06:55:36 -0500  
Message-Id: <941110065535\_4612231@aol.com>  
Subject: Re: 26FZ6

Jeff,

You are correct about their being a 26FZ6 in some R-392s.

Contrary to what Bill Hawkins said in an earlier response, the 26FZ6 was used in the R-392. It was a later replacement for the 26A6 in the RF amp stages. I think that it was designed for increased, more reliable performance at the low B+ voltage used.

You can use a 26A6 as a sub.

At one time Fair did have some of them. I have a couple for my R-392 that I purchased from them.

Joseph Pinner +  
Lafayette, LA  
KC5IJD

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Thu Nov 10 16:13:00 1994  
From: JosephWP@aol.com  
Date: Thu, 10 Nov 1994 15:09:34 -0500  
Message-Id: <941110150602\_4850197@aol.com>  
Subject: 51J-4 AM Filter Wanted

I am looking for a 6 Kc mechanical filter for my 51J-4.

Any help will be really appreciated.

Joseph Pinner +  
Lafayette, LA  
KC5IJD

JosephWP@aol.com

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Thu Nov 10 17:06:43 1994  
Message-Id: <CCMAIL.0093373.555722120094314FCCMAIL@EMIS.HAC.COM>  
Date: 10 Nov 1994 12:21:12 GMT  
From: "James C Reid" <0093373@ccmail.emis.hac.com>  
Subject: Bird dummy load for sale

Did some more digging in the garage and I've decided to sell off my Bird 37C dummy load. This unit is good up to 2500W if you plumb water lines up to it. I've used it in air cooled mode up to about 250W without any problems. It has a remote reading wattmeter to give you a rough estimate of how much power you're dumping into it. I don't know how accurate the meter is since I always used it with my ThruLine. A spare meter is included. It's in decent shape, minor dings, scratched paint, etc. It's only caveat is the resistance reads about 57 ohms. None of my transmitters ever complained, so I didn't worry much about it. It's yours for \$100 plus shipping(roughly 40 lbs.)

-Jim

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Thu Nov 10 18:27:24 1994  
From: KANAMAA%AMGATE%MATRXA@randb.abbott.com  
Date: Thu, 10 Nov 1994 10:11:51 -0500 (CDT)  
Subject: Drake XVTR Mod  
Message-Id: <01HJB6YZ7NHEFAP24K@RANDB.PPRD.Abbott.Com>

>From: Kana, Michael (D9CY)  
Date: Thu, Nov 10, 1994 10:14 AM  
Subject: Drake XVTR Mod  
To: boatanchors  
Howdy All

I have a friend who has the Drake R4/T4 and would like to interface the transmitter to the 6m/2m transverter. He would like to know what the mods are to disable the PA to do the interfacing. Any help or info would be appreciated.

Thanks es 73  
Mike Kana AA9IL

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Thu Nov 10 03:41:40 1994  
From: haynes@cats.ucsc.edu (Jim Haynes)  
Date: Wed, 9 Nov 1994 23:07:01 -0800  
Message-Id: <199411100707.XAA14511@hobbes.UCSC.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Dumbing down of Ham Radio

Well I'll agree with Paul Veltman that it didn't seem entirely sequitir that reducing the code speed required for a license would mean the end of AM. I guess the proposed explanation is  
lower code speed -> more hf operators -> more hf-ssb operators -> demand that AM be banned on HF.

Well, maybe. But that last step seems pretty speculative to me. There are

probably better reasons to argue against the code speed reduction.

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Thu Nov 10 05:19:57 1994  
Date: Thu, 10 Nov 94 08:31:13 GMT  
From: Harris Boldt Edelman <hbe@red-eft.la.ca.us>  
Message-Id: <9411100831.AA08175@red-eft.la.ca.us>  
Subject: Re: Dumbing down of Ham Radio

>AM. I guess the proposed explanation is  
> lower code speed -> more hf operators -> more hf-ssb operators -> demand  
> that AM be banned on HF.  
>  
>Well, maybe. But that last step seems pretty speculative to me. There are  
>probably better reasons to argue against the code speed reduction.

Not if your intention is to be a shrill alarmist, and to incite rather than  
to inform.

-H.

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Thu Nov 10 09:31:43 1994  
From: JosephWP@aol.com  
Date: Thu, 10 Nov 1994 08:34:23 -0500  
Message-Id: <941110083419\_4639183@aol.com>  
Subject: Re: Dumbing down of Ham Radio

-----  
>AM. I guess the proposed explanation is  
> lower code speed -> more hf operators -> more hf-ssb operators -> demand  
> that AM be banned on HF.  
>  
>Well, maybe. But that last step seems pretty speculative to me. There are  
>probably better reasons to argue against the code speed reduction.

Not if your intention is to be a shrill alarmist, and to incite rather than  
to inform.

-----  
I could not agree with you more. I was sorry to see that article reprinted in  
ER. I hope that it does not express Barry's mindset on this matter. It does  
not advance the cause of AM or vintage radio to become irrational and  
alarmist. I have a great deal of respect for code operators - they are  
preserving an important segment of radio heritage, but I also respect equally  
those who don't ever want to use code but who develop considerable skill in  
other areas (like vintage radio restoration/use, packet, contesting, etc.).  
There are many skill / knowledge areas which make up amateur radio. Code is  
only one. To connect the possibility of a change to slow code to the banning

of AM is not rational nor is it smart for the long run health of vintage radio. I sometimes think that many want to keep the growth of amateur radio to a minimum to preserve their little bailiwicks. Actually, they may cause the death of amateur radio as there are lots of commercial folks out there who would love to own our frequencies.

Joseph Pinner +  
Lafayette, LA  
KC5IJD

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Thu Nov 10 12:32:56 1994  
Date: Thu, 10 Nov 1994 07:53:26 -0800 (PST)  
From: paul Veltman <veltman@netcom.com>  
Subject: Re: Dumbing down of Ham Radio  
Message-Id: <Pine.3.89.9411100730.A21917-01000000@netcom12>

On Thu, 10 Nov 1994, Tony Stalls wrote:

> putting my Viking II on the air and a guy angrily yelled at me from across  
> the room that the FCC was going to outlaw AM.

I agree that there is a lot of hostility out there in general. It's been going on since I was a kid (at least). DXers vs Ragchewers, CW vs Phone, etc., etc.

> > Before I get excited about this, I'm going to have to see a more complete  
> > train of logic.

>

> Don was addressing the manufacturers association's attempt to sell more HF  
> transceivers by petitioning the FCC to revise the rules to lower the code  
> speed. As for the perspective, he was addressing the readers of his  
> newsletter, the AM PRESS EXCHANGE. The article was also published in the  
> August 1994 issue of ELECTRIC RADIO and was the subject of editorials in  
> the same issue and again in the October issues.

>

OK, but the train of logic still escapes me.

> I'm not sure what you mean about a "more complete train of logic", but  
> I'll look through my files and see what else I can come up with.

What I mean by a more complete train of logic is simply how one action must, by its very definition, elicit a specific reaction. The manufacturers of radios are interested in selling radios, and they probably don't give a rat's patutie about us and our AM rigs, let alone the working to ban, what you must admit, is a minority mode. They could

just as easily press to get the CW subbands removed, allowing phone over the entire bandwidth. Meanwhile, I get the W5YI report, and I keep an eye on the FCC gopher server. Until I hear something more definitive, I'm still not going to get too excited. But that doesn't mean that I'm going to ignore it completely.

73,

Paul WA6OKQ

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Thu Nov 10 13:16:24 1994  
Date: Thu, 10 Nov 1994 11:53:42 -0500 (EST)  
From: Tony Stalls <rstalls@access.digex.net>  
Subject: Re: Dumbing down of Ham Radio  
Message-Id: <Pine.SUN.3.91.941110111138.12811D-1000000@access4.digex.net>

Hello again Paul,

On Thu, 10 Nov 1994, paul Veltman wrote:

> > putting my Viking II on the air and a guy angrily yelled at me from across  
> > the room that the FCC was going to outlaw AM.  
>  
> I agree that there is a lot of hostility out there in general. It's been  
> going on since I was a kid (at least). DXers vs Ragchewers, CW vs Phone,  
> etc., etc.

Sometimes when I've forgotten that it's Sweepstakes weekend and switched on the rig hoping for a ragchew or whatever, I've yelled to myself about "those !\$#@%# contesters", but what the heck, I have a life outside ham radio, so I just go and entertain myself doing something else. Let 'em have their fun. I'll get my turn.

Something that probably escapes all of us at one time or another is that just because we don't like a particular facet of the hobby is no reason to think it's evil or those who enjoy it are somehow defective people. However, when it gets to the point of one group wants to enhance its interests at the expense of another, then it gets nasty. That's what we're talking about here.

> > > Before I get excited about this, I'm going to have to see a more complete  
> > > train of logic.  
> >  
> > Don was addressing the manufacturers association's attempt to sell more HF  
> > transceivers by petitioning the FCC to revise the rules to lower the code  
> > speed. As for the perspective, he was addressing the readers of his  
> > newsletter, the AM PRESS EXCHANGE. The article was also published in the  
> > August 1994 issue of ELECTRIC RADIO and was the subject of editorials in

> > the same issue and again in the October issues.  
> >  
> OK, but the train of logic still escapes me.  
>  
>  
> > I'm not sure what you mean about a "more complete train of logic", but  
> > I'll look through my files and see what else I can come up with.  
>  
> What I mean by a more complete train of logic is simply how one action  
> must, by it's very definition, elicit a specific reaction. The  
> manufacturers of radios are interested in selling radios, and they  
> probably don't give a rats patutie about us and our AM rigs, let alone  
> the working to ban, what you must admit, is a minority mode. They could  
> just as easily press to get the CW subbands removed, allowing phone over  
> the entire bandwidth.

Maybe I am an alarmist, but I don't think so. My motivation goes back to the first time no-code licensing was proposed. I was opposed to it and a lot of us vigorously lobbied toward it's being dropped. Our side lost and we sat back and breathed a sigh of relief. The FCC has a track record of rejecting second tries, so when it came up again, I think a lot of us figured that it would be turned down again. We were wrong and the numbers are swelling to the point that the VHF bands will be so crowded that they'll want to move up to HF and take over the whole thing. The digital modes will probably end up swallowing up the CW portion of the bands, but that's another subject.

Anyway, particularly when the sunspot cycle changes, it'll be like Sweepstakes weekend every day.

> Meanwhile, I get the W5YI report, and I keep an eye on the FCC gopher  
> server. Until I hear something more definitive, I'm still not going to  
> get too excited. But that doesn't mean that I'm going to ignore it  
> completely.

The industry association is well organized and well funded. W5YI and the others don't always know what they're up to and tactically, they can catch us surprise and it'll be all over. What Don Chester and others of us are doing is to nip this movement in the bud by letting them know up front that there will be vehement opposition. It's better to vaccinate than to treat the disease.

I don't want this discussion to sink to the depths of name calling and such ("flaming") although regrettably it seems to have already started. My interests are purely to preserve traditional amateur radio. I believe the hobby is worth working hard to earn (!) a license, but there are a big bunch of folks out there who don't, as you said, "give a rat's patutie" about anything, but selling radios and their publications. Amateur radio

is changing into something entirely different that it was when it was regularly called a "fraternity." You just don't hear that term much any more.

Food for thought...

73,

Tony  
K4KY0

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Thu Nov 10 14:38:33 1994  
Date: Thu, 10 Nov 1994 10:37:59 -0800 (PST)  
From: paul Veltman <veltman@netcom.com>  
Subject: Re: Dumbing down of Ham Radio  
Message-Id: <Pine.3.89.9411101017.A595-0100000@netcom20>

Tony,

I agree that a little preventive medicine is the best. This whole situation bears watching. While I agree that we need to protect our rights vis a vis AM phone, I don't think that we need to call out the army until the enemy decides to invade. Too much rhetoric may indeed have the opposite effect, much like the well known parable of the little boy who called wolf once too often.

So, at any rate, I am pleased that the article got posted, and I've saved it down to my home server. In fact, I may just foreward it to Fred (W5YI) for his information.

73,

Paul WA6OKQ

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Thu Nov 10 17:46:54 1994  
Date: Thu, 10 Nov 1994 16:33:43 -0500 (EST)  
From: Tony Stalls <rstalls@access.digex.net>  
Subject: Re: Dumbing down of Ham Radio  
Message-Id: <Pine.SUN.3.91.941110162606.864A-100000@access4.digex.net>

> Maybe I am an alarmist, but I don't think so. My motivation goes back to  
> the first time no-code licensing was proposed. I was opposed to it and a  
> lot of us vigorously lobbied toward it's being dropped. Our side lost and  
> we sat back and breathed a sigh of relief. ^^^^

I meant to say "Our side won." That's what happens when I type too fast.  
^^^

73,

Tony  
K4KY0

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Thu Nov 10 23:27:30 1994  
Date: Thu, 10 Nov 1994 21:10:09 -0500  
From: Nick England <nick@cs.unc.edu>  
Message-Id: <199411110210.VAA29101@altair.cs.unc.edu>  
Subject: forward - Swan help needed

DO NOT REPLY TO ME. REPLY DIRECT TO THE POSTER

=====

>From alan@thepoint.com Thu Nov 10 21:09:00 EST 1994  
Article: 7196 of rec.radio.amateur.equipment  
Path: ashe.cs.unc.edu!concert!gatech!symnet!usenet.ufl.edu!darwin.sura.net!  
howland.reston.ans.net!pipex!uunet!thepoint.com!c1.dyn.thepoint.com!alan  
>From: alan@thepoint.com (Alan B. Canon)  
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.equipment  
Subject: New Ham acquires Swan 420 "All-band" XCVR, wants info  
Date: Thu, 10 Nov 1994 08:17:02  
Organization: Travertine Environmental, Inc.  
Lines: 10  
Message-ID: <alan.15.000848FA@thepoint.com>  
NNTP-Posting-Host: c1.dyn.thepoint.com  
X-Newsreader: Trumpet for Windows [Version 1.0 Rev A]

I was visiting in Chicago two weeks ago and dropped \$20 on a non-functional Swan 420 HF rig. I popped the cover on the power supply last night and found a blown 10-A fuse. I hope to replace the fuse today to see if the power supply works.

Can anyone tell me anything about this radio? It has a BFO in a separate cabinet. I am really looking forward to finally using my Technician Plus HF privileges!

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Thu Nov 10 23:17:29 1994  
Date: Thu, 10 Nov 1994 21:10:25 -0500 (EST)  
From: Tony Stalls <rstalls@access.digex.net>  
Subject: HT-37 Story



Message-Id: <Pine.SUN.3.91.941110205633.6390B-100000@access1.digex.net>

About a year ago, I bought a Hallicrafters HT-37 for \$100 from an advertisement that (ahem) exaggerated it's condition. It did seem to work and has had all the modifications that I was told it might need, but it looks pretty rough. It has seen a lot of use as is evidenced by the paint having been worn off around the knobs where fingers rubbed. The cabinet was apparently repainted too. It's out of the cabinet from where I looked for the places for the mods and I never got around to putting it back. I'm not sure exactly where the feet are, but I think everything is around somewhere.

Considering that I already have five other boatanchor transmitters around, it's not likely that I'm going to put it on the air. I would prefer not to ship it because (1) it weighs a ton and (2) UPS is an hour and a half round trip from here and they're a hassle to deal with. However, I'm open for any remotely reasonable offer from a Hallicrafters fan. (Trade? I'm building a remote antenna tuner.)

73,

Tony Stalls, K4KY0  
Arlington, VA

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Thu Nov 10 12:07:47 1994  
Date: Thu, 10 Nov 1994 11:04:11 -0500 (EST)  
From: Tony Stalls <rstalls@access.digex.net>  
Subject: Re: Japanese (and others) paying high prices for boatanchors  
Message-Id: <Pine.SUN.3.91.941110104449.12811C-100000@access4.digex.net>

On Thu, 10 Nov 1994, Jim Haynes wrote:

> Gee, I wonder what we have to do to convince them that old Teletypes are  
> the items to collect.

Hearing about these kinds of things being lost to the scrap heap effects me about the same as somebody dragging their fingernails across a blackboard. However, I had to make a decision in that vein when I had to move once back in 1966. I had a complete communications set (SCR-299?? I'm not sure now) with the shelter for the back of the 2-1/2 ton truck (I didn't get the truck), BC-610, BC-342, teletype TU, a TT-5, TT-7, etc. and a 10 KW generator on a behemoth Army trailer to run the whole thing. To be honest, I was transferred on short notice to a place where at the time I could only afford an apartment and (gasp!) had no other choice than just dump it all. I had a brand new Swan-350 and was enamored with SSB, so it

didn't faze me much to "get rid of all that junk" at the time. The irony is that I'd dearly love to have all that stuff back and I live in a detached 3 BR house on a 100x55 lot. but even if I could wave a magic wand and make it all reappear, I still don't have the room for it. My Viking transmitters (3 of them anyway) and two Hammarlund receivers are stacked on top of each other as it is.

I guess that's one reason why those lovely old machines are ending up in the dump. (Sigh...)

73,

Tony  
K4KY0

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Thu Nov 10 12:42:41 1994  
Date: Thu, 10 Nov 94 15:56:59 UTC  
Message-Id: <101@ki5sl.ampr.org>  
From: ki5sl@ki5sl.ampr.org (Rick\_Blank)  
Subject: Licensing Observations

A lot has been talked about on the list here about whether it is good or bad to reduce the requirements for admission into the higher echelons of amateur radio.

My personal observations of a lot of the folks that have come into the hobby from the "codeless" ranks are sometimes quite ignorant of proper operating procedures, of how the different modes "work", and of the history and historical equipment used in ham radio. This is just observations made of people I know and have talked to, on the air and off.

There is a group of SSB'ers that have started using 3870 as "their" frequency. I know several of the fellows and get along well with them. When they first started using the frequency heavily a little over a year ago, I talked to a couple of them, in person, and dropped the hint that that was in an "unofficial" AM window...the kindest response I got was "BFD". Recently a gent who is now signing /AG and I were talking and he said: "Boy, those AM'ers were really tearing up the band last night, splatterin' and howlin' all over the place." (His rig is a TS-140) I proceeded to ask him how he discerned that they were "splatterin'". His reply was that he could hear the "howl" and then hear them on both sidebands when he tuned to zero beat, therefore, they must be doing something wrong....this guy has a

general class license? He is a perfect example of "buy a ricebox, put it on the air, disengage brain, engage mouth" hams.

I guess that I must be some kind of elitist scumbag because I don't believe someone with as limited a knowledge of radio modes and operation should have a general class license. If "they" want to reduce code requirements, then "they" should increase the technical requirements...Yes, I am only an advanced, I have passed the extra written, but I do not use CW enough to earn the 20wpm priveledges, so I have not earned the Extra class license, I guess I am too busy fooling with the old iron! Give me more technical tests, and I will take them!

A buddy who is an extra has complained that once he got the Extra license, there were no more tests to challenge his technical knowledge...he does use 35+ wpm CW...

Also, before you start accusing me of "Japan bashing" on the ham rigs, I do have several current vinatage riceboxes, both HF and VHF-UHF, and feel that they are good pieces of gear with no American alternatives available, i.e., the mobile dualbanders I use and my satellite rigs, so, I don't consider myself out of the loop on the new stuff either...each has it's place....I wouldn't like to drive a restored MG-TC everywhere I go ( if I had one! ) and running the BC-610 with a mechanical teletypewriter and the FSK converters would be about the same exercise! It can be done, but, that's a bit more than even I am willing to sacrifice!

The weekend is coming up, I hope everyone has a good one!

73 for now,

Rick Blank, KI5SL  
ki5sl@sat.ampr.org  
2223 Blanco Road  
San Antonio, Texas 78212  
end

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Thu Nov 10 16:32:33 1994  
From: JosephWP@aol.com  
Date: Thu, 10 Nov 1994 14:09:44 -0500  
Message-Id: <941110140936\_4817515@aol.com>  
Subject: Re: Licensing Observations

>>>

I guess that I must be some kind of elitist scumbag because I

don't believe someone with as limited a knowledge of radio modes and operation should have a general class license. If "they" want to reduce code requirements, then "they" should increase the technical requirements...Yes, I am only an advanced, I have passed the extra written, but I do not use CW enough to earn the 20wpm priveledges, so I have not earned the Extra class license, I guess I am too busy fooling with the old iron! Give me more technical tests, and I will take them!

>>>>

Rick,

I totally agree with you about this. In my mind, the code is a very poor screening technique. Make the tech and operating portions of the exams hard - that's the proper way to try to ensure that we have committed, competent people in our hobby.

Joseph Pinner +  
Lafayette, LA  
KC5IJD

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Thu Nov 10 17:40:51 1994  
From: "Steve Cornelius" <scornelius@ips.iac.honeywell.com>  
Message-Id: <9411101304.ZM4665@ws11.iac.honeywell.com>  
Date: Thu, 10 Nov 1994 13:04:46 -0700  
Subject: Re: Licensing Observations

Hey, I'm usually pretty quiet, so why not drop my \$0.02 in....

On Nov 10, 15:56, Rick\_Blank wrote:

> I guess that I must be some kind of elitist scumbag because I  
> don't believe someone with as limited a knowledge of radio modes  
> and operation should have a general class license. If "they" want  
> to reduce code requirements, then "they" should increase the  
> technical requirements...Yes, I am only an advanced, I have passed  
> the extra written, but I do not use CW enough to earn the 20wpm  
> priveledges, so I have not earned the Extra class license, I guess  
> I am too busy fooling with the old iron! Give me more technical  
> tests, and I will take them!

You bet. If the extra privileges of upgraded licenses are supposed to be an incentive, then they should be attainable by those who have learned enough to contribute to the hobby. There's nothing inherently wrong with banging out 35wpm in a contest, but I can't consider that a "contribution". The number of hams doing innovative things in the hobby is awfully small, IMHO.

I worked from nothing to Extra early last year as an attempt to "prove"

something to myself (and to prep for a GROL). It took about 60 days to get there, and 95% of the effort was 0 to 20WPM copy from the computer. It took about a week to learn enough for all 5 writtens. That just didn't seem right somehow.

(Granted, I trained as an EE, but \*still\*.....)

Most of the new ideas in these hobby are going to have to make use of a lot of experimental DSP work. How many Advanced/Extra licensees can explain how a DSP functions, let alone put code in the thing?

OBBoatanchors: How many of them can define transconductance? :)

In at least two areas of communications technology, be it solid state analog, hollow state analog, digital H/W, or whatever, each class of license ought to be able to:

Tech: Run it well, identify broken stuff, build a kit (without help)

General: Fix component level problems

Advanced: Fix anything, design simple to moderate mods

Extra: Design it.

> Also, before you start accusing me of "Japan bashing" on the ham  
> rigs, I do have several current vinatage riceboxes, both HF and  
> VHF-UHF, and feel that they are good pieces of gear with no  
> American alternatives available,

When I first licensed, I wanted a small/capable/inexpensive HF rig. Figuring that my best shot was probably a basketcase rebuild, I looked all over for a dead KWM-2 or like. I ended up with my FTdx570 for \$125 in great condition. After a tuneup and a few new tubes, it couldn't be better.

Some may scoff, yet I've been offered a healthy profit if I was willing to sell. But when the time comes. it'll likely go to new ham on a budget who can read a schematic.....

For now, the darn thing make a great spaceheater for my den :)

- steve, aa7xv

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Thu Nov 10 04:08:23 1994

From: bamodena@csemail

Message-Id: <9411100830.AA113153@csemail.cropsci.ncsu.edu>

Subject: Re: LOOKING FOR MANUALS

Date: Thu, 10 Nov 94 3:30:58 EST

Jack--

> According to mcimail (whose postmaster shouts nearly as loudly as you  
> do ;^) the address in your post:  
> SWITZER+\_E%A1%Electromagnetic\_Sciences@mcimail.com  
>  
> is invalid and does not exist... maybe by denying your existence, they  
> have encourgaed you to shout so, but we are willing to listen, and  
> even to play along, if you would but give us a valid e-mail reply  
> path...

I don't want to disappoint you....but I've corresponded with Emil at  
that email address...and, to boot, I email the boatanchors daily digest  
to that address and it hasn't bounced yet.

If that address has been unplugged since yesterday, then the digest  
going out in a few minutes will bounce...but yesterday's didn't.

--

73/Steve/AB4EL ab4el@Cybernetics.NET

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Thu Nov 10 16:47:21 1994  
Date: Thu, 10 Nov 1994 15:53:19 +0001 (EST)  
From: Ralph R Preston <Wolfster@world.std.com>  
Subject: R392 manual  
Message-Id: <Pine.3.89.9411101506.D5917-01000000@world.std.com>

Was someone out here looking for an R-392 manual? I have one dated 1961  
I'm not using.

\*\*\*\*\*

Ralph R Preston W01F  
formerly: KA1RZP

Wolfster@world.std.com

Murphy's golden rule:  
He who has the gold makes the rules.

\*\*\*\*\*

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Thu Nov 10 19:44:50 1994  
Message-Id: <mgalatz.1134897034A@198.7.0.2>  
Date: Thu, 10 Nov 94 18:16:34 EST  
From: "Menachem Galatz DC" <mgalatz@panix.com>  
Subject: R392 questions

Hi guys,

Some questions on the R392:

- 1) what is the ohm of the audio output, and does it need a special plug
- 2) what kind of power supply does it use, and how is the rig grounded
- 3) is the meter the type that glows in the dark (radium, etc)
- 4) does the rig have filter bypass caps across the power line going in that need to be checked or removed, or replaced?
- 5) I know its supposed to be waterproof, but how tough is it, ie is it made to be dropped, etc.
- 6) What kind of selectivity and sensitivity does it have
- 7) What type of antenna plug is there, balanced, unbalanced
- 8) any potential bugs with this rig?

Remember to lift with the knees!

Menachem Galatz DC  
mgalatz@panix.com

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Thu Nov 10 23:51:02 1994  
From: TOM.A.ADAMS@mail.admin.wisc.edu  
Subject: Re. R-392 Questions  
Date: Thu, 10 Nov 94 21:01 CST  
Message-Id: <EBAL0049.EBAL0101@mail.admin.wisc.edu>

to: boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu

Hello Menachem.

1- The audio output requires a special connector type, available from Fair Radio. I believe it's called a UG-229. The easiest way to deal with the problem is by buying the military speaker meant for GRC and VRC type radio sets; the connector is already there. BTW, audio output impedance is, like most military sets, 600 ohms.

2- The power supply required is 28 VDC @ aprox. 3.5 amperes. This too requires

a special connector, probably available from Fair Radio.

3- Re. radium meters; that's a good question. I've seen them with as well as without. Only way to be sure is to take a Geiger counter to the example in question ; -)

4- Re. power line filter; this is irrelevant since the radio does not contain an AC power supply.

5- How well is it built? Does the phrase "masonry comfort facility" tell you anything? The R-392 is not only designed to OPERATE under water (none of this silly "drip proofing" here!), but the beast is rated by the Army as being suitable for delivery via parachute drop; the manual says so!

6- Sensitivity is more than adequate, as is selectivity; it's been awhile since I've played with mine (a hazard of owning too many receivers) and I don't remember for certain, but I believe the narrowest selectivity position is 2 KHz. Be advised that sensitivity is VERY dependent on supply voltage input; at 28 VDC mine works like a champ, and at 24 VDC it's a bit of a dog.

7- Two antenna connectors on the rig, a spring loaded binding post and a BNC female. The two of them are connected in parallel.

8- No particular bugs in the radio, but a few caveats are in order.

Like an R-390A, this rig is VERY complex. Servicing is a real bear without a manual, and can get real interesting (to say the least) even WITH one. The radio's design is somewhat unique; it doesn't have a high voltage supply for B+ voltage, instead using 28 VDC directly on the tube plates. This makes the replacement of tubes kinda interesting. Conventional tube testing isn't a reliable indicator of tube performance at these voltages, so the best way to get peak performance is to swap tubes from a supply of them to get the tube that works best in a particular circuit!

A rather high level of technical expertise, plus good instincts, are necessary to get this rig working and keep it that way. I wouldn't recommend it to anyone except skilled technical types who like to tinker.

Essentially, the rig works very well when it works, but if it gets busted you're all alone up that well known creek; the size of your paddle is determined by your technical experience level. DEFINITELY not a radio for the beginner, or the casual listener.

Good Luck,

Tom "Mr. T." Adams, K9TA

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Thu Nov 10 19:51:19 1994



Date: Thu, 10 Nov 94 22:22:19 UTC  
Message-Id: <114@ki5sl.ampr.org>  
From: ki5sl@ki5sl.ampr.org (Rick\_Blank)  
Subject: Re: Re: Dumbing down of Ham Radio

In message <Pine.SUN.3.91.941110111138.12811D-100000@access4.digex.net>  
rstalls@access.digex.net writes:  
....text deleted....

> The industry association is well organized and well funded. W5YI and the  
> others don't always know what they're up to and tactically, they can catch  
> us surprise and it'll be all over. What Don Chester and others of us are  
> doing is to nip this movement in the bud by letting them know up front  
> that there will be vehement opposition. It's better to vaccinate than  
> to treat the disease.

>

> I don't want this discussion to sink to the depths of name calling and  
> such ("flaming") although regrettably it seems to have already started.  
> My interests are purely to preserve traditional amateur radio. I believe  
> the hobby is worth working hard to earn (!) a license, but there are a big  
> bunch of folks out there who don't, as you said, "give a rat's patutie"  
> about anything, but selling radios and their publications. Amateur radio  
> is changing into something entirely different that it was when it was  
> regularly called a "fraternity." You just don't hear that term much any  
> more.

>

> Food for thought...

>

> 73,

>

> Tony

> K4KY0

I agree with you totally, Tony, in fact the closet thing I have  
found to the "fraternity" that ham radio used to be is the folks  
here on the BA mailgroup.

It just seems to me that there are very few technical discussions  
going on in ham radio today, just tune across the bands and the  
most technical stuff you'll hear on HF (aside from some of the  
AM'ers) is: "the rig here is a Yaecomwood OU812-2000BMF with a  
3-element 15db gain, 9-band Flamin'Star antenna that I assembled  
myself, etc, etc...", but I think you get the point, very few of  
the run of the mill hams know anything about HOW radio works!  
Just ask some of the new hams what the difference between the  
filter and phasing methods of sideband generation are, or, why you  
can hear AM stations on either sideband!

Even the satellite guys are for the most part well trained  
appliance operators, I still operate thru A0-13, et al, but it's  
still not the same as putting a 30, 40, or 50 year old rig back  
into operating condition and using it on the air again!

Rick Blank, KI5SL  
ki5sl@sat.ampr.org  
2223 Blanco Road  
San Antonio, Texas 78212  
end

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Thu Nov 10 08:59:28 1994  
From: Fire Bottle archive handler <firebotl@jackatak.theporch.com>  
Subject: RF and alligator clips  
Date: Thu, 10 Nov 1994 7:06:40 -0600 (CST)  
Message-Id: <9411100706.aa08352@jackatak.theporch.com>

Jeff-

> I've been using alligator clips between my xmtrs, tuner, and longwire  
> antenna (because my station is located in my campus office).  
Alligators, and not Fahnstock?

> What's the general feeling with regard to how well these clips work  
> at RF?

Depends upon how high up you go... ;^) I suspect that at 450MHz they  
would present some impedance bumps that might really get funky. At  
1.750 Mc or 3.7 Mc, I use'em to tap my mobile coil. Sure, I could do  
better with solder and permanent taps, but things change when  
mobiling, and I don't have enough time to re-solder once a week, so I  
use 'Gator Clips.

> When connecting I always twist the clips a bit so they bite into  
> clean metal.

That's what I do, too.

73,

Jack, W4PPT/Mobile (75M SSB 2-letter WAS #1657 -- all from the mobile! ;^)

Fire Bottle Server (Boat Anchors Get Out and Keep You Warm!)

firebotl@jackatak.theporch.com

Where Old Radios and Fun ... GO TOGETHER!

+-----human interface: root@jackatak.theporch.com-----+

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Thu Nov 10 23:45:29 1994  
From: vancleef@netcom.com (Henry van Cleef)  
Message-Id: <199411110207.SAA14622@netcom15.netcom.com>

Subject: RME-45 power transformer

Date: Thu, 10 Nov 1994 18:07:21 -0800 (PST)

First, a quick note of thanks to all who responded to my posting about a new power transformer for an RME-45 radio.

I've located an NOS replacement that is a mechanical bolt-in, but is 750 VCT instead of 670, has enough 5V to heat a 5U4, and extra amps for 6.3. It sounds like a larger coil on a taller stack of the same laminations used for the original transformer. The one FP capacitor I have found to replace the original 15-15-10 mfd unit is a 40-20-20 500V, so ripple should be hard to find.

I sharpened my engineering pencil to see how best to deal with the 40 extra volts. Calculations show that using the 12-henry choke that RME so thoughtfully provided, between the 80 and first filter, and a 150 ohm resistor between the two filter sections, will knock down B+ from about 305 to 260 volts. A 5Z3 plugged in the 80 hole should shove things back to about 285 volts, if there is a problem at 260.

I did a current draw analysis, using the RME manual and the Sams voltage measurement information, plus some work with a tube manual and curves, and come up with the astounding number of 140 ma. being yanked out of that original 80 power supply. The 5500/4500 ohm bleeder feeds 10 ma. to the screen bus at 110 volts, with over 20 ma. continuing on to ground. That sounds like a lot of mils to throw away, and a lot of British Thermal Units. Also, the 7C5 output tube should be able to work properly with its operating point set 10-15 ma. lower (bigger cathode resistor). There are 10 extra ma. going to keep the VR-150 alive, but all of the calculations work to indicate that an RME-45 without a VR-150 drew around 130 ma., not the 116 that the transformer and choke are rated for.

--

-----  
Hank van Cleef vancleef@netcom.com vancleef@tmn.com  
The Union Institute History of Science and Technology  
-----

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Thu Nov 10 19:09:15 1994

Date: Thu, 10 Nov 94 14:48:10 PST

From: glitwin@craysea.cray.com (Gary Litwin)

Message-Id: <9411102248.AA14120@craysea.cray.com>

Subject: SP600-JX info wanted.

Hello, Boat'ers!

A friend of mine is looking for a schematic or manual that includes a schematic so he can adjust the alignment on his SP600-JX.

He would be happy to reimburse for costs, or even purchase a manual if anyone has one for sale.

You can contact me with particulars, and I'll pass them on so he can contact you.

Thanks in advance for your help!

Gary Litwin  
glitwin@craysea.cray.com

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Thu Nov 10 03:45:41 1994  
Date: Wed, 9 Nov 94 20:51:35 HST  
From: jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu (Jeffrey Herman)  
Message-Id: <9411100651.AA09414@kahuna.math.hawaii.edu>  
Subject: Stuff from rec.radio.swap

More goodies from wreck.radio.swap. // Jeff NH6IL

\*\*\*\*\*

Article: 17002 of rec.radio.swap  
>From: jorden@bianca.amd.com (Pat Jorden)  
Subject: tubes for sale...

tubes for sale, used, military grade, carefully tested, boxed:

6AU6A	GE and RCA brands	\$2.00 each
6BL8	Sylvania brand	\$2.00 each
6DJ8	Sylvania brand	\$3.00 each
ECC88 / 6DJ8	Telefunken brand	\$5.00 each
5814A	Sylvania and GE brands	\$2.00 each
5963 / 12AU7A	TungSol brand	\$2.00 each
12AT7 / ECC81	Sylvania and GE brands	\$3.00 each
3-14 Ballast	Amperite brand	\$4.00 each

All of these are good quality tubes in good cosmetic condition.

pat jorden  
pat.jorden@amd.com

Article: 17026 of rec.radio.swap  
>From: ablackbelt@aol.com (ABLACKBELT)

Subject: WTB Drake RV75 VFO + Filters

Looking for drake rv75 vfo and two cw and one ssb filters for newly  
acquired drake tr7 rig.

ablackbelt@aol.com

Article: 17031 of rec.radio.swap

>From: rtaylor@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu (Roger Taylor)

Subject: Garage Sale

Eico 753 3 band SSB transceiver \$75

Eico 751 Power Supply (above) \$39

Tektronix model 650A TV studio/station monitor \$195  
670A \$195

Precision Sine/SQ wave audio generator \$49

Eico 377 Sine/SQ wave audio generator \$39

Heathkit HW-12 80 meter ssb transceiver \$49

HW-22 40 meter \$49

HW-23 Power supply for above \$49

833A tridoe (new) \$39

4-125s (new) \$25

Back issues of 73 and Ham Radio, all years.

Article: 17040 of rec.radio.swap

>From: mwchang@taco.engr.ucdavis.edu (Mark William Chang)

Subject: Comm'l. Transmitter and other Tubes for sale

4X150G new \$39 used \$22

4X150A new \$39 used \$22

8121 used \$65

8321 used \$65

JAN 836 new 5000 volt MIPV, 1A rect. \$16

5998 (6AS7GYB equiv.) series regulator, new \$9

5R4 WGB new \$4

JAN 5670 new \$3

6111 WA new \$5

Used tubes are guaranteed usable.

Price does not include shipping.

E-mail Mark Chang (mwchang@taco.engr.ucdavis.edu)

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Thu Nov 10 18:59:56 1994

Date: Thu, 10 Nov 1994 17:11:21 -0500 (EST)

From: Tony Stalls <rstalls@access.digex.net>

Subject: Traditions

Message-Id: <Pine.SUN.3.91.941110163618.864B-100000@access4.digex.net>

I guess that I'm sort of responsible for starting this discussion about what a lot of us perceive as a threat to AM and what I call, "traditional" amateur radio. Am I an alarmist? Maybe... But I am genuinely concerned that the HF bands will turn into something that doesn't resemble anything like amateur radio as we know them, especially when it's just to enhance manufacturer's profits.

I've been told by people at the FCC that their philosophy is "give the amateurs what they want", but who determines that? Who REALLY speaks for amateur radio? I don't recall telling anybody that they speak for me. I speak for myself and regularly file comments and reply comments with the FCC. I've been known to visit, call, and write pretty regularly too.

The point is that if we let the FCC know what we want, then those who propose these "dumbing down" rule amendments and claim that they speak for "the overwhelming majority of the amateur radio community" will at least have a tougher time of it. As Don Chester (K4KYV) said, the industry group met at Dayton this year and got their ball rolling. If we want to stop it, now is the time.

73,

Tony Stalls, K4KY0

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Thu Nov 10 17:20:53 1994

From: djw@unlinfo.unl.edu (daniel wright)

Message-Id: <9411102000.AA05351@unlinfo.unl.edu>

Subject: Re: Tucker Electronics, Tradition, and Japan (fwd)

Date: Thu, 10 Nov 1994 14:00:46 -0600 (CST)

Forwarded message:

> From djw@unlinfo.unl.edu Thu Nov 10 13:59:08 1994

> Date: Thu, 10 Nov 94 13:58:58 CST

> Message-Id: <9411101958.AA13657@unlinfo2.unl.edu>

> X-Sender: djw@unlinfo2

> Mime-Version: 1.0

> Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

> To: djw@unlinfo.unl.edu

> From: djw@unlinfo.unl.edu (Daniel Wright)

> Subject: Re: Tucker Electronics, Tradition, and Japan

> X-Mailer: <PC Eudora Version 1.4>

>

> >To: boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu

> >From: djw@unlinfo.unl.edu (Daniel Wright)

> >Subject: Re: Tucker Electronics, Tradition, and Japan  
> >  
> > Tony sez:  
> >>>From my study of Japanese art and it's evolution over the past 1000 years,  
> >>I think that the reason they're buying up antique art works (that includes  
> >>our boatanchors) is that the culture has always coveted tradition.  
> >  
> > This is true.  
> >  
> > In addition,when I first began to notice these things(read:buy Japanese  
> electronics,not too many years ago,the U.S. dollar was "worth" 150 Yen.  
> Today that dollar is worth 97 Yen...I don't know a lot about economics,but  
> >doesn't this mean that Japanese currency will buy more "dollar value" in  
> U.S. goods??  
> >  
> > Dan -- WA0JRD  
> >  
>  
>